DCSS P3 PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WORKGROUP
JULY 25, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY

A. GENERAL

On Tuesday, July 25, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Management Practices Workgroup held its first official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- Debbie Campora, FTB-Statewide Project
- ☑ . Rita Carroll DCSS, Policy & Operations
- ☑ . Sharon Covarrubias, FTB-Child Support Collections Program
- ☑ . Stan Dettner, FTB-Statewide Project
- ☑ . Nan Flette, LA County CAO
- ☑ . George Gliaudys Jr. (Co-Leader), LA County FSD
- ☑ . Kevin Harrison, Orange County FSD
- ☑ . Mary Herdegen, Placer County CEO
- ☑ Lisa McCann, DCSS-Policy & Operations
- ☑ Cindy Moore, Sonoma County FSD
- ☑ . Nora O'Brien, ACES
- ☑ Linda Patterson (Co-Leader), DCSS-Policy & Operations
- ☑ Pam Rouse, Ventura County FSD
- ☑ . Terri Silveira-Love, Shasta County FSD
- ☑ . Rachel Subega, Santa Clara County FSD

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Debbie Campora at debbie campora@ftb.ca.gov

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Larry Wilson opened the discussion with a brief overview of our last meeting, and review our objectives for this session.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Issue: Provide Information to those who need it, when they need it, through easy-to-use tools and methods.

DCSS-Final 8/30/00 1 09/05/00

- 2. Tasks:
- Define current problem
- Define components within/without program that need information
- Define what and when information is needed
- Develop survey questions and target audience
- Determine what Department is doing or has done
- Evaluate what information media works
- Identify what is not needed
- Develop recommendations
- 3. Presentation by Michael Graham on the vision and status of the DCSS Web Site.

D. **DISCUSSION ISSUE**:

<u>Define current State-level problems</u>

- People not getting information
- Current process is cumbersome
- Distribution of information doesn't always work
- How do we know who to send/forward information to?
- How does Department solicit information prior to dissemination?
- Timeframes too short for sending information
- Information is not always correct
- Tend to react more than plan
- Lack of protocol for distribution
- Information context/style may not help communication of decisions
- Need to make information usable to recipient
- Need to be aware of impacts of information on downstream users
- May be too many hands in process
 - o FSD Letters
 - o Duplication
 - o Ensure required review adds value
- Increasing number of stakeholders for communication
- Counties not always involved in front-end development
- Counties do not always have time to adequately react to directives/change

Define current Local/County-level problems

- Training Issues
 - Vast information resources required by staff
 - o How to distill useful formats for employees, clients

DCSS-Final 8/30/00 2 09/05/00

- Ability to deliver services is limited by structure (See action item)
- Need to proactively go to counties to train in new methods, processes
- Need to provide uniform answers or responses by all staff
- Clarify Board of Supervisors' role in program, decision making

Information issues at county level

- Need for ongoing training for information updates
- High staff turnover
- Limited qualified labor pool
- Timely internal information dissemination
- Inter-county communication for client/customer service

Resolution Suggestions

- 1. Email at all locations
- 2. Structure that offers an opportunity for input
- 3. Standing committees for development and review
- 4. Interpret directives to be useful to staff: State should provide detailed directives to assure uniformity
- 5. State needs to assume more responsibility to recognize county needs,
 - recognize workload impacts at county level
- 6. IV-D Directors responsible for information dissemination within their county
- 7. Regional administrators must have responsibility in information dissemination for counties
- 8. State should continue to fund at least a basic level of automation at county level
- 9. Re-enforce responsibilities for information flow and communication at all levels of program organization
- 10. More access to meetings (e.g. more open meetings)
- 11. Need to have a feedback mechanism from implementers to promulgators
- 12. Maintain good relations among key stakeholders to facilitate improved communication
- 13. Policy Suggestion: State will support levels of automation and tools to ensure uniform responses at county level
- 14. Promote ongoing work sessions to discuss/develop best practices
- 15. State needs to help set goals and priorities at county level
- 16. Ensure adequate levels of funding
- 17. Maintain partnership with community groups which will provide feedback on how "system" is working and service being delivered by FTB
- 18. Insist and assist counties in using best practices
- 19. Consider functional specialization within staffing, organization to reduce staff information requirements
- 20. Leverage learning and access to information through tools
- 21. Log information that has been disseminated "Public Access"

DCSS-Final 8/30/00 3 09/05/00

E. **DISCUSSION ISSUE:** Define components within/without program that need information from the Child Support Program.

WHO	WHEN*	WHAT
DAs/ FS Administrators Advocates	WILLY	 General Specific Legislation Rules Policies Regulations Program Info Performance Measures County Performance
DCSS – Central Office - Regional Offices		 Statistics FSD Letters Policy Regulations Performance Measures Statistics County Performance Federal Guidelines DHS/DSS Regulations & Policies Board of Supervisor Minutes Legislation FTB Activities
FTB-Statewide & CAMP		Same as DCSS
County Administrator Office		Same as DA
Legislature – Staffers & Aides		Performance MeasuresGeneralSpecific Reports

Judicial Council Courts Commissioners Facilitators Clerks		 Legislation Child Support Form Changes Performance Information Budget/Funding Information (Family Law Facilitator) Program Information Statewide System
Attorney General/DOJ		 UIFSA/Locate – Federal Regulations & State Statute Interstate Form Changes Local Case Information for Status Reponses Appeals
US Attorney's Office		 State Protocols for case processing Contacts Roles & Responsibilities Case Referrals Case Specific Information
EDD		 Specific Case Information Automation Interface Requirements Project Specific Information Legislation Information Appeals Hearing Results Regulations/Policy
State Agencies License Revocation Intercepts		Case InformationContactsVerification Requirements
Welfare-TANF	Early On-Time After the Fact	 Policy/Regulations Legislation Case Practices Same as DCSS
General Public		 Performance – How are we doing? Basis for Program Program Profiles/

		Dung and dramag
		Procedures
		Responsibilities
		Non IVD Population
		Outreach
CA Trade Associations		Real Estate Liens
		• Forms
		• Event/Process
		Requirements
Caseworkers	On time	Other County
• Staff	After the Fact	Information
		 Same as DCSS
		• Regulations, performance
Clients-Case Members	Early	Public Outreach
	On time	 Program Policy &
		Procedures
Other States/Countries		
ACF / OCSE		
Region IX		
• D.C.		
Employers		
IRS		
Financial Institutions		
Other County Agencies		Automation Interfaces
County Probation		Foster Care Cases
		• Information on Rules & Policies
		• Case Practices
Social Services Agencies		General
Food Banks		References
• Shelters		
Mental Health Clinics		
County Board of Supervisors		Program Specifics
		Background
		Performance
		Requirements
		 Roles & Responsibilities
		• Expectations
		Feedback
		• Situational – White
		Papers & Issues
		1 apers & 155ues

*WHEN:

- Early For input into issue, process
- On Time As an event occurs, e.g., case processing FIDM
- After the Fact Regulations, policy, general information, status, performance measures, statistics

Due to time constraints the table above was not completed in terms of adding when information may be needed by the interested parties. This part of the discussion was closed by noting that the major players were identified for our purposes. We also recognized that a more detailed analysis of this process will take place during the business process engineering phase of the CCSAS project.

F. DISCUSSION ISSUE: Develop Survey Questions and Target Audience

Survey Ideas

Information

- How information is disseminated?
- What works for information dissemination?
- What barriers exist to communication, training, educating staff?
- How do you provide training?
- What methods do you use to communicate within management team?
- When you receive a policy directive from the State, what is the process you use to implement the directive at line-staff level?

Roles & Responsibilities

- County organization chart/structure
- Case management
- How do you monitor performance?
- What is the role of Attorneys within the management structure?

Target Audience

All 58 counties

First Line Managers - IV-D Directors' choice

<u>Informational Note: DCSS' Target Counties for 1410 Reviews</u> (Survey first went to Directors for dissemination to line staff back up to Director)

- Nevada
- Sonoma

- - Napa
 - Del Norte
 - San Joaquin

Santa Clara

- Lake
- Kern
- Alameda
- Madera
- Los Angeles
- Lassen
- Sacramento
- Imperial

G. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

- 1. Discuss with Julie regarding training uniformity (Larry)
- 2. Discuss pushing down decision-making authority (Kevin)
- 2. Develop, Distribute & Compile survey (Nora, Linda & Lisa)
 - a. Email to workgroup by 7/26 for comments;
 - b. Distribute to counties by 7/28 with response due by 8/4/00;
 - c. Compile information back to group by 8/14.

H. ATTACHMENTS

None